

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/070,209	. 07/1	2/2002	Masahiro Sakanaka	57094 (71526)	57094 (71526) 9390	
21874	7590	04/29/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP				LEITH, PA	LEITH, PATRICIA A	
P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,				1654		
				DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Advisory Action	10/070,209	SAKANAKA ET AL.						
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Patricia Leith	1654						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:</li> </ol>	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	of Appeal. To avoid at affidavit, or other evidence ompliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of								
b) Lightharpoonup The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI		D WITHIN TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action: or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must the AMENDMENTS	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because								
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>		TE below);						
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			(DTOL 204)					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	nent canceling					
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ worlded below or appended.	vill be entered and an	explanation of					
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
3.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a National Na	Notice of Appeal will <u>r</u> vit or other evidence	not be entered is necessary					
<ul> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ul>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).					
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See 'Addendum to Advisory' attached hereto.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:					

Patricia Leith Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1654

13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Application/Control Number: 10/070,209

Art Unit: 1654

## ADDENDUM TO ADVISORY ACTION

Applicant's arguments as well as the Declaration by the Inventor were considered in-part. It is noted that the Declaration attempts to provide evidence that lower doses of Rb<sub>1</sub> (i.e., 60µg/kg) provide for an unexpected result over the prior art which taught that doses of 10,20 and 40 mg/kg were effective in treating brain ischemia. However, what is shown in the graph of Figure 3 (it is noted that Applicant has indicated that the page containing the graph is 'Figure 3' although the page is not marked 'Figure 3') is contradictory to what has been shown in the prior art. For example, Zhang et al. (as previously cited) clearly taught that the same procedure resulted in a 22% decrease in occlusion for 10 mg Rb<sub>1</sub>/kg/day and a 50% decrease in occlusion for 40 mg Rb<sub>1</sub> /kg/day (see Table 1, p. 46). There is no explanation in the Declaration or in the Arguments section to why this data is contrary to what was known in the art. Therefore, the Examiner concludes that there must have been an error in protocol (again, absent any reasonable explanation) and thus, these results are deemed skewed and do not provide sufficient evidence of any unexpected results. An extensive, detailed analysis of differences in the method described in the Declaration compared with Zhang et al. for example would provide for more than a simple cursory review which is the standard for entrance of amendments submitted after final action which present new evidence. It is further noted that the claims are much broader in scope than what Applicant is attempting to provide evidence for unexpected results.

Art Unit: 1654

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia Leith whose telephone number is (571) 272-

0968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patricia Leith Primary Examiner Art Unit 1654

04/20/05